DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 274 SO 022 690

AUTHOR Ryker, Jannette A.; And Others
TITLE Value Priority Differences between Males and Females.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Psychological Association (Portland, OR, May 2, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; College Graduates; College Students; *Comparative Analysis; Females; Males; Needs Assessment; *Psychological Studies; *Sex Differences; Statistical Analysis; Student Attitudes; *Values

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to replicate and extend previous gender difference research by identifying differences in value priorities. College graduates were given the Rokeach Value Survey as part of their testing prior to graduation in the spring of 1989, 1990, and 1991. Using the Mann-Whitney U statistic, significant differences between the groups were found for 14 of the 36 items on the Rokeach Value Survey and for 5 of 8 Schwartz Motivational Value Clusters. Males placed a higher value priority on a comfortable life, an exciting life, pleasure, social recognition, obedience, politeness, and self-control; with the motivation clusters of hedonism, stimulation, and conformity ranking higher for males. Females placed a higher priority on a world at peace, equality, inner harmony, self-respect, broad-mindedness, independence, and being loving; the motivational clusters ranked higher by females were self-direction and universality. The results are discussed in the context of current gender research. A list of 35 references, as well as five tables that supplement the study are included. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED351274

Value Priority Differences Between Males and Females

Jannette A. Ryker Daniel M. Mayton II Cheryl D. Granby

Lewis-Clark State College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
DANIEL M. MAYTON II
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 022 690

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Portland, Oregon, May 2, 1992.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to replicate and extend previous gender difference research by identifying differences in value priorities. College graduates were given the Rokeach Value Survey as part of their testing prior to graduation in the spring of 1989, 1990 and 1991. Using the Mann-Whitney U statistic, significant differences between the groups were found for 14 of the 36 items on the Rokeach Value Survey and for 5 of 8 Schwartz Motivational Value Clusters. Males placed a higher value priority on a comfortable life, an exciting life, pleasure, social recognition, obedience, politeness, and self control; with the motivation clusters of hedonism, stimulation and conformity ranking higher for females. Females placed a higher priority on a world at peace, equality, inner harmony, self-respect, broad-mindedness, independence and being loving; the motivational clusters ranked higher by females were self direction and universality. The results are discussed in the context of current gender research.

Value Priority Differences Between Males and Females

Understanding individual preferences and the standards or criteria individuals use in making decisions is a question of values. Human values are enduring prescriptive or proscriptive beliefs that specific modes of conduct or end-states of existence are preferred to other modes of conduct or end-states. Values and the priorities individuals place upon them have been shown to be critical factors in determining attitudes and behavior (e.g. Feathers, 1975; Rokeach & Ball-Rokeach, 1989; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987).

Ongoing research on value priorities has been conducted since the late 1960s when Rokeach first introduced the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS, Rokeach, 1968, 1973). The work which Rokeach began has spawned a multitude of value priority studies. Results have shown that "the rankings of various terminal and instrumental values are significantly related to variations in socioeconomic status, age, gender, race, religion, and life-style (Rokeach and Ball-Rokeach, 1989, p. 776)" as well as being "significant predictors of many social attitudes and behaviors (p. 776)."

One notable contribution to values theory over the past five years has been put forth by Schwartz and Bilsky (1987). They have begun to establish a universal structure of human values. Schwartz (1990) has elaborated on this earlier work to identify ten universal motivational domains for values using the

assumption that values are derived from (1) the needs of individuals as biological organisms, (2) the requisites of coordinated social interaction, and (3) the survival and welfare needs of groups. These universal domains, their characteristic definitions, and the sample values included in each as outlined by Schwartz' work are presented in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 About Here

The purpose of this paper is to review and extend previous value research pertaining to gender differences. While some studies have focussed specifically on value-gender differences, the majority of the relevant value research investigated value-gender differences as a secondary or tangential factor of the study. Our review of the value literature summarizes consistent gender differences utilizing the universal value domains (Schwartz, 1990; Schwartz and Bilsky, 1987) as a framework to synthesize the research findings. In addition, this paper also presents new value-gender difference data which applies the value domains as a guiding principle in the analysis.

Gender Differences

Gender Differences Among Children

Gender differences begin early in life (Gilligan, 1982) and are noted in childhood game playing roles as well as communication skills. Boys and girls are not simply groups of

small humans; the differences they exhibit will follow them throughout the course of their lives causing both confusion and concern.

As early as age 4, gender differences have been noted in stimulation (Ginsberg & Miller, 1982). When observing the children in a naturalistic setting, a zoo, they found that more preschool boys, school-age boys, and preadolescent boys were risk-takers than girls the same age were. The risks included riding an elephant, petting and feeding a burro, feeding other animals and climbing an embankment.

Dubois (1990) found significant differences in achievement as measured by sports related attitudes in groups of 8-10 year olds. Boys and girls developed considerably different attitudes toward winning and the importance of team membership after only one season of play. Males regarded winning as significantly more important while females, who ranked winning as less important to begin with, ranked it of even less importance at the end of the season.

Gilligan (1982) discussed gender differences in game playing roles and noted boys were able to compete and win or lose while still maintaining relationships as such within the framework of the rules of the game. Females, on the other hand, were willing to sacrifice winning in competitive situations in order to maintain their relationship patterns, thus exhibiting more benevolence than males.

Regarding security, boys generally have a more difficult time adjusting to their parents' divorce than girls do. Conflicts between mothers and sons are still common as long as six years after divorce while mothers and daughters have adjusted farly well by this time (Hetherington et al., 1982). However, other studies suggest that boys tend to adjust better when the father is the custodial parent than when the mother is (Santrock et al., 1982).

Crime statistics reveal that males are more likely to be arrested than females, and they tend to be arrested for more overt crimes. In the United States, 47 percent of the arrests for such serious crimes as murder, assault, and robbery, involve youths under the age of 21 (U. S. Department of Justice, 1984). Social conformity, it seems, is more difficult for young males than for their youthful female counterparts.

Gender Differences Among Adults

Women have consistently shown higher scores in altruism ratings or the value of helping; men score higher on aggressiveness scales (Rushton et. al., 1986). Also different value rankings between males and females have been shown to correlate with level of moral judgement (Parish, Rosenblatt & Kappes, 1979). There is a significant difference in motivation for prosocial behavior as demonstrated by volunteerism between the sexes, which may be due to the fact that "caring for others may be more deeply embedded within female role expectations and

thus requires a less complex rationalization than is true among some males (Serow, 1990)."

Since gender differences within the workplace has been the focus of much public and private attention, it stands to reason that a great deal of research has been dedicated to this topic. Among male and female entrepreneurs significant differences were found in their value priority rankings (Fernald & Solomon, 1987). In a study on managerial work values it was found that gender differences existed between intrinsic and extrinsic value rankings with females placing higher emphasis on intrinsic rewards in the workplace (Brenner & Blazini, 1988).

Interestingly, in a study by Powell, Posner, & Schmidt (1984) it was found that while male and female managers differed in their value systems, females "place a greater emphasis on their careers in comparison with their family or home lives and feel less anxiety about any effect of career on home life". This may be due in part to the fact that women have more barriers to overcome in holding managerial positions.

In a study on value priority differences, Jones (1990) discovered that college students differed not only by gender but by age as well. Traditional students, those moving from the high school level immediately into college, placed greater emphasis on value items associated with traditional sex-role stereotypes. These differences seemed to become somewhat less pronounced as students age. Nontraditional students, those returning to

college after a period of time in the workforce or as homemakers, became more androgynous.

Feathers' (1984) research indicated that while masculine and feminine values are measurable and predictable, androgyny, as a mulitdimensional concept, proved much more difficult to measure using the additive model or the balance model. Values may be classified as masculine or feminine, with an overlap between the genders occurring, but when measuring overall psychological health and well-being, masculinity had a much more positive effect than femininity.

Value Differences Using the RVS Across Gender

Value priority rankings using the Rokeach Value Suurvey (RVS) are natural variables to consider in gender difference research. In fact, gender differences within RVS value hierarchies have been consistently found across national samples in the United States (Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Rokeach, 1973, 1979) and Finland (Helkama et al., 1987) as well as in many nonrepresentative samples such as those in Australia (Feather, 1972, 1973, 1979), Northern Ireland (McKernan & Russell, 1980), and the United States (Craig & McCartin, 1988). Significant differences between the value priorities of males and females identified in these studies are summarized in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 About Here

Based on the significant differences summarized in Table 2, three value domains appear to represent values more important to females and three appear to represent values which are more important to males. The two universal value domains of security and self-direction contain values in which previous research disclosed inconsistent patterns between gender.

Males seem to consistently place a higher priority on the values of pleasure and a comfortable life which both make up the hedonism domain representing pleasure or sensuous gratification for oneself. Males also consistently placed a higher priority on the stimulation value domain (an exciting life) represented by excitement, novelty, and challenge in life. The final value domain which appeared to be a higher priority for males involved achievement or personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards. While two studies revealed females placed a higher priority on social recognition than males, males placed a consistently higher priorities on being ambitious and capable and having a sense of accomplishment than females.

The benevolence domain or the preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact is reflected in the values placed on being helpful, forgiving, and honest. This value domain was constantly a higher priority for females in the reviewed studies. Females also seemed to consistently place higher priority on being obedient

and polite which are two of the three values in the conformity domain. Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms appeared to be more important to females. The universalism domain emerges as another domain which females prioritized at a higher level than males. This domain represents the understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature. The literature indicates that females overwhelmingly ranked the five values in this domain higher.

Failure to communicate effectively, to really understand one another, is an age old complaint between the sexes. Men and women it seems, not only demonstrate significant differences in their value priority rankings, they seem determined to misunderstand each other. Linder and Bauer (1983) conducted a study of the differences in value rankings between genders and levels of perceived understanding of the others rankings. While there were a few similarities in value rankings, "females misunderstand the relative importance to males of nine values and males misunderstand females' position concerning six values (p. 62)." Not only does one group misunderstand the other, each is unaware of the other's misunderstanding. When analyzed a second time a year later, both groups reported feeling misunderstood by the other (Linder & Bauer, 1984). Research on gender differences is continually being conducted in an effort to reduce these

misunderstandings and increase awareness of basic gender differences, thus reducing the gender conflict.

Based on the gender differences research and the value gender research, two hypotheses emerge for testing in this study. First of all, it is hypothesized that males will place higher priorities on the universal value domains of hedonism, stimulation, and achievement. Second, females will place higher priorities on the value domains of benevolence, conformity, and universalism.

METHODS

Participants

The participants in this study were graduating seniors from Lewis-Clark State College in Lewiston, ID. There were three samples of students surveyed: those graduating in the years 1989, 1990, and 1991 consecutively. Students were given the survey as a part of their routine exit exams.

There were a total of 237 participants in the study. Of these, 83 were male and 154 were female. Students surveyed in 1989 numbered 74, 69 in 1990, and 94 in 1991. The mean age of students graduating from Lewis-Clark State College is 30 years.

Design and Instrumentation

Respondents were given the Rokeach Value Survey - Form G (RVS) to assess their value priorities. The RVS measures 18 terminal, or end-state, values and 18 instrumental, or conduct related, values in order of their importance as a guiding

principle in the respondents' lives. The value on which the highest priority is placed is ranked 1, the second highest ranked 2, and so on until the lowest value ranks 18. The 1 through 18 priority ranking is performed separately for instrumental and terminal values forming two personal value hierarchies (Rokeach, 1973).

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to identify specific differences between the sexes in value priorities and value domains. It was hypothesized that males and females would differ significantly both in individual value priority rankings and between value domains. As predicted, the samples did exhibit significant differences in their value priority rankings when computed by gender.

Using the Mann-Whitney U method of statistical analysis, significant differences between genders were found in 14 of the 36 items on the terminal and instrumental value hierarchies. The means, medians, and standard deviations for both hierarchies in the RVS are presented in Table 3 and Table 4.

Insert Tables 3 and 4 About Here

Before the value data was subjected to further statistical analyses, the ranks were transformed to standard scores (z scores) using the method described by Feather (1975). Composite

value ranks for the terminal values for the each sample were computed from the mean transformed ranks. In like fashion, the composite ranks for the instrumental values were computed separately. These composite terminal and instrumental values are presented in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

Individual values were then grouped to form Schwartz' motivational domains as presented in Table 1 (Schwartz, 1990). Only eight of the ten motivational domains defined by Schwartz can be delineated with the RVS. The domains and their corresponding values are as follows: 1) hedonism (a comfortable life, pleasure), 2) stimulation (an exciting life), 3) security (clean, family security, inner harmony, national security, responsible), 4) conformity (obedient, polite, self-controlled), 5) self direction (freedom, imaginative, independent, intellectual, logical, self-respect, 6) benevolence (forgiving, helpful, honest, loyal), 7) universalism (a world of beauty, a world of peace, broadminded, equality, wisdom), and 8) achievement (ambitious, a sense of accomplishment, capable, social recognition).

The means, medians and standard deviations for the eight motivational domains are presented in Table 5. Significant differences between genders were found in 5 of the 8 domains.

Insert Table 5 About Here

Males consistently placed a significantly higher priority on the terminal values, 1) a comfortable life, 2) an exciting life, 3) pleasure, and 4) social recognition; and on the instrumental values, 1) obedience, 2) politeness, and 3) self-control. Among the motivational domains they placed a higher value upon 1) hedonism, 2) stimulation, and 3) conformity.

Females consistently placed a significantly higher value priority on the terminal values, 1) a world at peace, 2) equality, 3) inner harmony, and 4) self-respect; and on the instrumental values, 1) being broadminded, 2) independence, and 3) being loving. Among the motivational domains they placed a higher value upon, 1) self-direction, and 2) universalism.

None of the remaining 22 terminal and instrumental values, or the three remaining motivational domains, revealed any significant difference by gender.

DISCUSSION

As predicted, the results of this study demonstrated significant differences in value priority rankings when analyzed by gender. Twenty five years later, current values research shows that little, if any, variation has been found in predicted results. After years of striving toward a more androgynous society, males and females still predictably vary on the importance of certain instrumental and terminal values when compared by sex.

The females in this study (mean age = 30 years) placed a

higher value on intrinsic values: independence, inner harmony, self-respect, being broad-minded, independence, and conformity. The males (mean age = 30) placed a higher value on extrinsic values: a comfortable life, an exciting life, social recognition, and politeness. Traditional gender roles still existed for this group and were evident in the values each sex retained. Age and level of education seemed to make something of a difference in the equalization of value priorities. However, in light of the results of this college educated sample, any equalization of value priorities seems minimal.

Most notable among the significant differences found in this study were those in the Schwartz motivational domains. Gender differences were glaringly obvious in their intrinsic/extrinsic value priorities: males chose to place a higher value upon hedonism, stimulation, and conformity; females placed a higher value on self-direction and universalism.

The tenacity of gender differences in value priority ranking suggests that they are indeed formed at an early age, accounting for the differences found in children at play (Gilligan, 1982; Ginsburg & Miller, 1982; Dubois, 1990) and in observing the increasing differences occurring throughout childhood (Beech & Shoeppe, 1974; Hetherington, et al., 1982; Santrock, et al., 1982).

As adults, these differences remain and affect every aspect of life from book reading behaviors (Becker & Connor, 1982) to

managerial styles and career motivation (Powell, Posner & Schmidt, 1984). This study supported significant differences in hedonism, stimulation, conformity, self-direction, and universalism along traditional gender lines.

Hopeful, however, are the results for this group which indicated no significant differences in the values of security, benevolence and achievement for genders. That is, males seemed to be becoming more benevolent toward others, females were becoming more attentive toward achievement, and both sexes were equally security oriented. This suggests that males are possibly getting more in touch with their feelings and becoming more empathetic towards others, whereas females are getting closer to realizing their potential beyond the traditional homemaking roles.

In order to determine whether we are indeed moving closer together as a society, and to determine trends and shifts in the value priorities of Americans as a whole, long term longitudinal studies will have to be conducted. This is the only way to truly assess the shifts in differences and similarities in value priority rankings by gender over a period as long as twenty five years.

REFERENCES

Ball-Rokeach, S.J. (1973). Values and violence: A test of the subculture of violence thesis. American Sociological Review, 38, 736-749.

Ball-Rokeach, S., Rokeach, M., & Grube, J. (1984) The great American value test. New York: Free Press.

Becker, B.W., & Conner, P.E. (1982). The influence of personal values on book reading behavior. Journal of Library Administration, 3(1), 13-23.

Beech, R.P., & Schoeppe, A. (1974). Development of value systems in adolescents. Developmental Psychology, 10, 645-656.

Brenner, O.C., Blazini, A.P., & Greenhaus, J.H. (1988). An examination of race and sex differences in managerial work values. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32, 336-344.

Craig, D.E. & McCartin, R. (1988, April). A longitudinal study of values in early adolescence. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Burlingame, CA.

Dubois, P. (1990). Gender differences in value orientation toward sports: A longitudinal analysis. Journal of Sport Behavior, 13(1), 3-13.

Feather, N.T. (1972). Value similarity and value systems in state and independent secondary schools. Australian Journal of Psychology, 24, 305-315.

Feather, N.T. (1973). Value systems of students in Papua New

Guinea and Australia. International Journal of Psychology, 9, 91-104.

Feather, N. T. (1975). Values in education and society. New York: Free Press.

Feather, N.T. (1979). Value correlates of conservatism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1617-1630.

Feather, N.T. (1979). Values in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), Handbook of adolescent psychology (pp. 247-294). New York: Wiley.

Feather, N.T. (1984). Masculinity, femininity, psychological androgyny, and the structure of values. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 604-620.

Feather, N. T. & Newton, J. W. (1982). Values, expectations, and the prediction of social action: An expectancy-valence analysis. Motivation and Emotion, 6, 217-245.

Fernald, L.W., & Solomon, G.T. (1987). Value Profiles of male and female entrepreneurs. The Journal of Creative Behavior, 21, 234-247.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ginsburg, H. J. & Miller, S. M. (1982). Sex differences in childrens' risk-taking behavior. Child Development, 53, 426-428.

Helkama, K., Salminen, S., & Uutela, A. (1987). A world at peace as a personal value in Finland: Its relationship to

demographic characteristics, political identification, and type of moral reasoning. In Current research on peace and violence. Tampere, Finland: Tampere Peace Research Institute.

Hetherington, E. M., Cox, M. & Cox, R. (1982). Effects of divorce on parents and children. In Michael E. Lamb (Ed.) Non-traditional Families: Parenting and Child Development. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Jones, C.H. (1990). Age related differences in college students' values, College Student Journal, __, 292-295.

Linder, F., & Bauer, D. (1983). Perception of values among male and female undergraduate students. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 56, 59-63.

Linder, F., & Bauer, D. (1984). Men's and women's perceptions of values and subsequent feelings of understanding or misunderstanding. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 58, 773-774.

McKernan, J., & Russell, J.L. (1980). Differences of religion and sex in the values systems of Northern Ireland adolescents. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 19, 115-118.

Parish, T.S., Rosenblatt, R.R., & Kappes, B.M. (1979). The relationship between values and moral judgment. Psychology: A Quarterly Journal of Human Behavior, 16(4), 1-5.

Powell, G.N., Posner, B.Z., & Schmidt, W.H. (1984). Six effects on managerial value systems. Human Relations, 37, 909-921.

Rokeach, M. (1973). The nature of human values. New York: Macmillan.

Rokeach, M. (1968). Beliefs, attitudes, and values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rokeach, M. (ed.) (1979) Understanding human values. New York: Free Press.

Rokeach, M., & Ball-Rokeach, S.J. (1989). Stability and change in American value priorities. American Psychologist, 44, 775-784.

Rushton, J.P., Fulker, D.W., Neale, M.C., Nias, D.K.B., and Eysenck, H.J. (1986). Altruism and aggression: the heritability of individual differences. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 1192-1198.

Santrock, J. W., Warshaka, R. A. & Elliott, G. L. (1982). Social development and parent-chid interaction in father-custody and stepmother families. In Michael E. Lamb (Ed.) Non-traditional Families: Parenting and Child Development. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Personal communication.

Schwartz, S. H. & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal structure of human values. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 550-562.

Serow, R.C. (1990. Volunteering and values: An analysis of students' participation in community service. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 23, 198-203.

United States Department of Justice. (1984). Crime in the United States. Washington, DC: Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Table 1
Universal Motivational Domains for Values (Schwartz, 1990)

Motivational Domain	Definitional Phrases	Example of Values Within Each Domain
HEDONISM	Pleasure or sensuous gratification for oneself.	pleasure, enjoying life
STIMULATION	Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life.	daring, a varied life, an exciting life
SECURITY	Safety, harmony and stability of society, of relationships, and of self.	family security, national security, social order, cleanliness, reciprocation of favors, sense of belonging
CONFORMITY	Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms.	obedience, self-discipline, politeness, honoring parents and elders
SELF-DIRECTION	Independent thought and action--choosing, creating, exploring.	creativity,freedom,curiousity, independent, choosing own goals
BENEVOLENCE	Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact.	helpful, forgiving, honesty, loyalty
UNIVERSALISM	Understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature.	social justice, broadmindedness,world at peace, wisdom, a world of beauty, unity with nature, protecting the environment, equality
ACHIEVEMENT	Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards.	success, capabilty, ambition
POWER	Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources.	social power, wealth, authority, preserving public image
TRADITION	Respect, commitment and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion impose on the self.	accepting one's portion in life, devotion, respect for tradition, humility, moderation

Table 2

Review of Gender Differences Across Values Within Universal Motivational Domains (Schwartz, 1990)

Motivational Domain Individual Values	Significant Differences	References
Hedonism		
Pleasure	Females place higher priority Males place higher priority	Rokeach, 1973 Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1972, 1979
A Comfortable Life	Males place higher priority	Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1972, 1979; McKernan & Russell, 1980; Rokeach, 1973
Stimulation		
An Exciting Life	Males place higher priority	Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1972, 1979; Rokeach, 1973
Security		
Family Security	Females place higher priority	Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1972; McKernan & Russell, 1980
National Security	Males place higher priority	Feather, 1972
Clean	Females place higher priority	Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1979; Rokeach, 1973
Inner Harmony	Females place higher priority	Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1972, 1979; Rokeach, 1973
Responsible	Males place higher priority	Feather, 1972
Conformity		
Obedient	Females place higher priority	Feather, 1972; McKernan & Russell, 1980
Polite	Females place higher priority	Feather, 1972, 1979; McKernan & Russell, 1980
Self-Controlled	no significant differences	
Self-Direction		
Imaginative	Males place higher priority Females place higher priority	Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1972; McKernan & Russell, 1980 Ball-Rokeach, 1973
Intellectual	Males place higher priority	Feather, 1972; McKernan & Russell, 1980
Freedom	Males place higher priority Females place higher priority	Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1972; McKernan & Russell, 1980 Feather, 1979
Self Respect	Females place higher priority	Rokeach, 1973
Independent	Males place higher priority	Craig & McCartin, 1988; Feather, 1972, 1979
Benevolence		
Helpful	Females place higher priority	Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Craig & McCartin, 1988; Feather, 1972
Forgiving	Females place higher priority	Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Craig & McCartin, 1988; Feather, 1972; McKernan & Russell, 1980 Rokeach, 1973
Honest	Females place higher priority	Feather, 1972; McKernan & Russell, 1980
Universalism		
Broadminded	Females place higher priority	Feather, 1972, 1979
A World of Peace	Females place higher priority	Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1972; McKernan & Russell, 1980; Rokeach, 1973; Helkama, et al., 1987
Wisdom	Females place higher priority	Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1972, 1979; McKernan & Russell, 1980; Rokeach, 1973
A World of Beauty	Females place higher priority Males place higher priority	Feather, 1972, 1979 McKernan & Russell, 1980
Equality	Females place higher priority Males place higher priority	Feather, 1972, 1979 Rokeach, 1973
Achievement		
Capable	Males place higher priority	Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Craig & McCartin, 1988; Feather, 1972, 1979; Rokeach, 1973
Ambitious	Males place higher priority	Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1972, 1979; Rokeach, 1973
A Sense of Accomplishment	Males place higher priority	Feather, 1972; McKernan & Russell, 1980; Rokeach, 1973
Social Recognition	Females place higher priority Males place higher priority	Feather, 1979; McKernan & Russell, 1980 Rokeach, 1973

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

Means, Medians, and Standard Deviations by Gender for Terminal Values on the RVS

	Males			Females			
	Mean	Median	SD	Mean	Median	SD	P
A comfortable life	9.651	10.00	4.952	11.032	12.00	5.034	.0319
An exciting life	10.108	11.00	5.444	12.591	14.00	4.491	.0008
Accomplishment	9.265	9.00	4.543	8.208	8.00	4.380	.1097
Peace	10.651	12.00	5.660	8.857	10.00	5.324	.0093
A world of beauty	13.133	14.00	3.993	12.344	13.00	3.851	.0989
Equality	11.494	12.00	4.753	9.357	10.00	4.302	.0005
Family	6.614	6.00	4.767	6.468	6.00	4.355	.9841
Freedom	6.867	6.00	4.501	7.149	6.50	4.329	.6073
Health	5.181	4.00	3.443	5.747	5.00	3.564	.2442
Harmony	9.325	9.00	4.829	7.812	7.00	4.983	.0207
Love	8.181	8.00	4.334	8.688	9.00	4.663	.4464
National security	12.699	14.00	4.808	12.357	13.00	4.270	.3200
Pleasure	10.181	10.00	4.505	12.714	14.00	4.311	.0000
Salvation	10.711	14.00	7.041	9.974	11.00	6.606	.4203
Self-respect	7.614	7.00	4.090	5.662	5.00	3.827	.0002
Social recognition	12.277	13.00	4.335	14.149	15.00	3.894	.0010
Friendship	8.012	8.00	3.711	8.435	8.00	4.002	.9865
Wisdom	8.988	9.00	4.868	8.974	9.00	4.853	.9865

Table 4

Means, Medians, and Standard Deviations by Gender for Instrumental Values on the RVS

	Males			Females			
	Mean	Median	SD	Mean	Median	SD	P
Ambitious	8.354	8.00	4.702	8.942	9.00	5.359	.5170
Broadminded	10.220	11.00	5.006	8.766	8.00	4.863	.0286
Capable	8.805	9.00	4.536	8.916	9.00	4.412	.8206
Clean	11.024	11.00	4.959	11.143	11.50	4.938	.8073
Courageous	11.488	12.00	4.453	10.727	11.00	4.623	.2680
Forgiveness	9.488	10.00	5.102	8.208	8.00	4.546	.0607
Helpful	9.698	9.50	4.238	9.720	10.00	4.423	.8323
Honest	4.476	3.00	3.932	4.058	2.00	3.839	.5494
Imagination	12.390	14.00	5.010	11.455	12.00	4.790	.0682
Independence	9.622	9.50	5.204	7.643	7.50	4.782	.0054
Intellectual	9.488	10.00	5.681	9.422	10.00	4.757	.9520
Logical	10.890	12.00	4.879	10.818	11.50	4.565	.8614
Loving	8.451	7.00	5.425	6.734	5.00	4.872	.0178
Loyal	7.829	7.00	4.632	7.961	7.00	4.867	.9121
Obedient	13.159	14.00	4.686	15.734	18.00	3.782	.0000
Polite	9.476	9.50	4.877	12.065	13.00	4.382	.0001
Responsibility	6.073	5.00	4.545	5.527	5.00	6.648	.9807
Self-commitment	9.512	9.00	4.440	10.916	12.00	4.841	.0218

Table 5

Means, Medians, and Standard Deviations by Gender for Universal Motivational Domains

	Males			Females			
	Mean	Median	SD	Mean	Median	SD	P
Hedonism	-.0642	-.1500	.69087	-.4274	-.5100	.72593	.0002
Stimulation	-.1142	-.2100	1.01897	-.5710	-.6700	.83661	.0008
Achievement	-.0415	-.1125	.47890	-.1199	-.1325	.49633	.4091
Conformity	-.2245	-.1667	.52616	-.6953	-.6800	.47896	.0000
Benevolence	.3152	.3362	.45241	.3758	.4137	.46244	.2304
Universalism	-.2589	-.3520	.54743	-.0212	-.0040	.41641	.0004
Security	.0601	.1270	.39412	.1355	.1510	.34597	.1816
Self-direction	-.0968	-.1240	.51437	.0877	.0820	.39290	.0020